

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
CAMDEN VICINAGE

XPEL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOPE TINTINGS, LLC,

Defendant.

HONORABLE KAREN M. WILLIAMS

Civil Action

No. 1:24-cv-07684-KMW-EAP

**ORDER**

**WHEREAS**, on July 10, 2024, plaintiff XPEL, Inc. (“Plaintiff”) filed its Complaint in this action against defendant Dope Tintings, LLC (“Defendant”) (ECF No. 1); and

**WHEREAS**, on July 16, 2024, Defendant was served with copies of the Complaint and Summons (ECF Nos. 6, 9); and

**WHEREAS**, on August 20, 2024, the Clerk of Court, at Plaintiff’s request, entered default against Defendant for failure to plead or otherwise defend (ECF No. 12); and

**WHEREAS**, on September 4, 2024, counsel for Defendant—without entering an appearance on Defendant’s behalf—informed the Court that Defendant was attempting to retain counsel to defend it in this matter (ECF No. 13); and

**WHEREAS**, on September 10, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Default Judgment against Defendant pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) (ECF No. 15); and

**WHEREAS**, on October 1, 2024, Defendant’s non-attorney agent, Ricardo Ranger, filed a Cross-Motion to Vacate Default, which also seeks an extension of time within which to obtain legal counsel and respond to the Complaint (ECF No. 17); and

**WHEREAS**, the Court having considered the pending Motions (ECF Nos. 15, 17), and finding good cause to enlarge the time within which Defendant may respond to the Complaint;

**IT IS** this 6<sup>th</sup> day of **February 2025** hereby

**ORDERED** as follows:

- A) The Clerk of Court's prior entry of default against Defendant is **VACATED**.<sup>1</sup>
- B) Defendant shall respond to the Complaint **on or before March 7, 2025**. However, Mr. Ranger is advised that business entities may not appear *pro se* and may not otherwise be represented by anyone who is not licensed to practice law.<sup>2</sup> As such, any response to the Complaint submitted on Defendant's behalf must be filed by a licensed attorney admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.
- C) Defendant's Cross-Motion to Set Aside Default (ECF No. 17) is **DENIED** and rejected as an improper submission.
- D) Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment (ECF No. 15) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to seeking the entry of default and renewing its Motion in the future, should Defendant fail to respond to the Complaint as ordered herein.
- E) Plaintiff shall serve a copy of this Order on Defendant within three days of its entry.

*Karen M. Williams*

---

KAREN M. WILLIAMS  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Feliz v. Kintock Grp.*, 297 F. App'x 131, 137 (3d Cir. 2008) (recognizing authority of district courts to *sua sponte* set aside entries of default for good cause).

<sup>2</sup> See 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (providing that a party may proceed in federal court "personally or by counsel"); see also *Colony Ins. Co. v. Kwasnik, Kanowitz & Assocs., P.C.*, 288 F.R.D. 340, 342 n.2 (D.N.J. 2012).